

### ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and the personal interview conducted on September 11, 2006, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 7-28, and 30-51 remain in this application. Claims 6 and 29 have been canceled. New claim 52 has been added.

Claims 1-5, 20-28, 30-35, 44-49, 51 (30-35), and 51 (44-49) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saylor *et al.* (US 6792086). Claims 7-12, 15, 18-19, 29, 36-39, 42-43, 50, 51(36-39), 51(42-43), and 51(50) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor in view of Maes (US 6073101). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor in view of Beyda *et al.* (U.S. 6,487,277). Claims 16-17, 40-41, and 51(40-41) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor in view of Woods *et al.* (U.S. 6,510,417). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed at the personal interview, Saylor does not teach any uploading of a plurality of interactive voice response applications with executable components, where the plurality of interactive voice response applications use a common speech recognition module, which includes user-specific speech models, for executing on said system. The Examiner argued that the claims don't specifically recite that the interactive voice response applications use the user-specific speech models. The Examiner also stated that Saylor teaches using user specific voice prints for identification purposes.

However, it was pointed out to the Examiner that the application interaction of the invention can occur after identification has already occurred. Thus, the Examiner suggested that amending the claims to recite such identification, that the application

interaction occurs after identification, and that the user-specific speech models are used by the applications and customized for the user, would overcome the rejections.


Accordingly, various claims have been amended to recite that the user is identified, that the user-specific speech models are adapted to specific users, and that an identified user interacts with the system such that the interactive voice response applications interact with the user-specific speech model for the identified user via a common speech recognition module. As discussed at the personal interview, the prior art does not teach such features.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33226.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:   
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

September 20, 2006